

REMARKS

Claims 39, 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by EP 0 884 626 to Takeda et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants maintain and incorporate by reference herein those arguments previously advanced. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider those arguments and withdraw this §102(b) rejection. In addition, although Applicants do not agree that the Examiner's interpretation of the pattern of Claim 39 is reasonable, Applicants have amended independent Claim 39 in order to expedite prosecution. In light of this, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the following new arguments and comments expanding upon the previous arguments.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Takeda et al. reference fails to disclose the claimed method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes the step of “exposing and developing said resist film and forming a resist pattern having a shape on said pixel electrode pattern in which multiple branches extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem connecting among the multiple branches,” as defined in independent Claim 39 (emphasis added). One example of an embodiment of the claimed resist pattern with “multiple branches [that] extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem connecting among the multiple branches ” is represented by resist pattern 34X of Figure 36T. Other examples of the claimed resist pattern, such as pattern 34Y of Figure 37, are shown and described in

the present specification. Such branches help orient the liquid crystal molecules of perpendicular orientation in the proper direction.

In contrast to the claimed resist pattern of Claim 39, the resist pattern of Figure 71 of the Takeda et al. reference does not have “multiple branches [that] extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem connecting among the multiple branches.” More specifically, patterns 20A and 20B of Figure 71 of the Takeda et al. reference are merely a plurality of parallel sets of lines bent to form apexes. Lines 20A and 20B cannot be considered as including the claimed multiple branches that extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem connecting among the multiple branches because patterns 20A and 20B lack, *inter alia*, a feature that resembles the claimed “stem connecting among the multiple branches.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 71 of the Takeda et al. reference does not disclose the claimed step of forming a resist pattern in which “multiple branches extend outwardly from both sides of a main stem,” as defined in independent Claim 39.

Further, the Examiner has not shown that the patterns of Figures 71 and 161 of Takeda et al. are resist patterns that are formed by “exposing and developing” a resist film, as defined in independent Claim 39. Instead, the Examiner has merely referred to the figures. Thus, for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(b) rejection of independent Claim 39 and associated dependent Claims 41 and 42.

Claims 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,959,763 to Bozler et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 40-42 all depend from independent Claim 39, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 39, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 40-42 under Takeda et al. in view of Bozler et al. be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 39, and also because Bozler et al. does not remedy the deficiencies mentioned above.

Claims 40 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,452,653 to Yamanaka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 40 and 43 both depend from independent Claim 39, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 39, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 40 and 43 under Takeda et al. in view of Yamanaka et al. be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 39, and also because Yamanaka et al. does not remedy the deficiencies mentioned above.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference

would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner
is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
James K. Folker
Registration No. 37,538

February 2, 2006

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\0941\68350\9X5844.DOC